

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

7 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.

10 DAVID JERRY PAULE,

11 Defendant.

NO: 2:18-CR-227-RMP

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

12
13 BEFORE THE COURT is Defendant's Motion for Reconsideration, ECF
14 No. 75. Defendant asks this Court to reconsider its ruling at ECF No. 73, denying
15 Defendant's motion to continue sentencing in this matter. The Court has
16 considered the record, the motion, and is fully informed.

17 The Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure do not expressly authorize motions
18 for reconsideration. *United States v. Krug*, Case No. CR 09-01148-MMM, 2012
19 WL 12973474, at *1 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2012). However, courts generally have
20 held that motions for reconsideration may be filed in criminal cases and "are
21

1 governed by the rules that govern equivalent motions in civil proceedings.” *Id.*
2 (citing cases).

3 Reconsideration is an “extraordinary remedy, to be used sparingly in the
4 interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources.” *Kona Enters., Inc. v.*
5 *Estate of Bishop*, 229 F.3d 877, 890 (9th Cir. 2000). A motion for reconsideration
6 “should not be granted, absent highly unusual circumstances, unless the district court
7 is presented with newly discovered evidence, committed clear error, or if there is an
8 intervening change in the controlling law.” *McDowell v. Calderon*, 197 F.3d 1253,
9 1255 (9th Cir. 1999) (citation omitted). District courts have broad discretion in
10 deciding whether to grant a motion for reconsideration. *Simon v. City of Phoenix*,
11 No. CV–09–701–PHX–MHM, 2010 WL 1038606, at *1, (D. Ariz. March 19, 2010).

12 Defendant asks this Court to reconsider its prior order denying his requested
13 continuance, arguing again that his medical issues should be addressed prior to
14 sentencing and that he should be given additional time to interview his sister. *See*
15 ECF No. 75. He does not present new arguments or new, controlling law.

16 Through a supporting declaration, Defense counsel provides additional details
17 about the steps taken to reach out to Defendant’s sister for an interview. ECF No.
18 75-1. However, Defense counsel repeatedly has attempted to contact Defendant’s
19 sister about this case since October 11, 2018. *See id.* at 1. There is no basis for
20 concluding that granting a continuance will result in Defense counsel’s ability to
21 contact Defendant’s sister when Defense counsel’s previous efforts have failed.

1 Defendant's motion does not present newly discovered evidence or an
2 intervening change in controlling law, nor does Defendant argue that the Court
3 committed clear error. *See* ECF No. 75. Therefore, no grounds warranting
4 reconsideration exist.

5 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to
6 Reconsider, **ECF No. 75**, is **DENIED**. The District Court Clerk is directed to
7 enter this Order and provide copies to counsel.

8 **DATED** February 19, 2020.

9
10 *s/ Rosanna Malouf Peterson*
ROSANNA MALOUF PETERSON
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21